arXiv:1612.00519v1 [math.CV] 2 Dec 2016

On Lebesgue Constants for Interpolation Points on a Quasiconformal Arc

Vladimir Andrievskii

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242

Running head: Lebesgue constants

Mailing address:

V.V. Andrievskii
Department of Mathematical Sciences
Kent State University
Kent, OH 44242, USA

E-mail address:
andriyev@math.kent.edu

Phone: (330) 672 9029

Abstract

Using the theory of quasiconformal mappings, we simplify the proof of the recent result by Taylor and Totik (see IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis **30** (2010) 462–486) on the behavior of the Lebesgue constants for interpolation points on a compact set in the complex plane.

Key Words: Lebesgue constants, Leja points, Interpolation, Quasiconformal arc.

AMS classification: 30C62, 30E10, 31A15.

1. Introduction

For a compact set K in the complex plane C with a positive logarithmic capacity and $\mathrm{N} := \{1, 2, \ldots\}$, consider a triangular array $Z := \{z_{n,k}\}_{1 \le k \le n, n \in \mathrm{N}}$ of points in K (i.e., an *interpolation scheme* on K) such that $z_{n,k} \ne z_{n,j}$ for $k \ne j$. In the theory of the Lagrange interpolation of continuous functions on K an important role is played by the *Lebesgue constants*

$$\Lambda_n = \Lambda_n(K, Z) := \sup_{z \in K} \sum_{k=1}^{n} |l_{n,k}(z)|,$$

where

$$l_{n,k}(z) := \frac{\prod_{1 \le j \le n, j \ne k}(z - z_{n,j})}{\prod_{1 \le j \le n, j \ne k}(z_{n,k} - z_{n,j})}$$

(see [3, 7]).

The starting point of our consideration are the following recent results by Taylor and Totik [8]. We refer the reader to [5, 6] for basic notions of potential theory. We say that Λ_n are *subexponential* if

$$\Lambda_n^{1/n} \to 1, \quad \text{for } n \to \infty. \tag{1.1}$$

We associate with the rows of Z the *normalized counting measures*

$$\nu_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \delta_{z_{n,k}}, \quad n \in \mathrm{N},$$

where δ_z denotes the unit mass at $z \in \mathrm{C}$.

Let μ_K be the equilibrium measure of K. We say that ν_n are *asymptotically distributed like* μ_K if $\nu_n \to \mu_K$ in the weak* sense.

Theorem A ([8, Theorem 1.1]). *If Λ_n are subexponential then ν_n are asymptotically distributed like μ_K.*

Simple examples show that even for $K = [-1, 1]$, the inverse is not necessarily true.

Theorem B ([8, Theorem 6.3]). *Let $K = [-1, 1]$. If ν_n are asymptotically distributed like μ_K and if each pair of points in the nth row of Z satisfies the distancing rule*

$$|z_{n,j} - z_{n,k}| \ge c_1 \left(\frac{\sqrt{1 - |z_{n,j}|}}{n} + \frac{\sqrt{1 - |z_{n,k}|}}{n} + \frac{1}{n^2} \right), \quad 1 \le j, k \le n, j \ne k \tag{1.2}$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$, then Λ_n are subexponential.

The last theorem plays a crucial role in establishing (1.1) for the Leja points on the compact set with a piecewise C^2-smooth outer boundary.

The main objective of our paper is to extend Theorem B to the case of an arbitrary quasiconformal arc (see [1, 4]) and simplify its original proof. We use the following traditional for the approximation theory in the complex plane idea.

For $K = I := [-1, 1]$ denote by $I_{1/n}, n \in \mathrm{N}$, the ellipse with foci at ± 1 and the sum of semiaxes equal to $1 + 1/n$. Such an ellipse is the image of the circle $\{w : |w| = 1 + 1/n\}$ under the Joukowski mapping $z = \Psi(w) = (w + 1/w)/2$ of $\mathrm{D}^* := \{w : |w| > 1\}$ onto $\overline{\mathrm{C}} \setminus I$, where $\overline{\mathrm{C}} := \mathrm{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. Then, for $x \in I$ and $n \in \mathrm{N}$,

$$\frac{1}{c_2}\rho_{1/n}(x) \le \frac{\sqrt{1 - |x|}}{n} + \frac{1}{n^2} \le c_2\rho_{1/n}(x)$$

holds with a constant $c_2 \ge 1$, where

$$\rho_{1/n}(x) := \inf_{\zeta \in I_{1/n}} |\zeta - x|, \quad x \in I$$

is the distance from x to $I_{1/n}$

The notions of $\Psi, I_{1/n}$ and $\rho_{1/n}$ are also meaningful for a bounded arc $K = L$ in C which is the key to a generalization of Theorem B.

2. Main result

From now on, we make the assumption that $\Omega := \overline{\mathrm{C}} \setminus K$ is connected and regular with respect to the Dirichlet problem. Denote by g_Ω the Green function of Ω with pole at ∞, and let for $z \in K$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$K_\delta := \{\zeta \in \Omega : g_\Omega(\zeta) = \log(1 + \delta)\}, \quad \rho_\delta(z) := d(z, K_\delta),$$

where

$$d(z, B) := \inf_{\zeta \in B} |z - \zeta|, \quad z \in \mathrm{C}, B \subset \mathrm{C}.$$

We say that Z is *well separated* (on ∂K) if

$$z_{n,k} \in \partial K, \quad n, k \in \mathrm{N}, 1 \le k \le n \tag{2.1}$$

and each pair of points in the nth row satisfies

$$|z_{n,k} - z_{n,j}| \ge c_3\rho_{1/n}(z_{n,k}), \quad 1 \le k, j \le n, k \ne j, \tag{2.2}$$

where $c_3 > 0$ is a constant.

In numerical analysis one of the most important examples of Z with (2.1)-(2.2) is the set of *Leja points* which is defined inductively as follows. Let $z_1 \in \partial K$ be arbitrary. If $z_1, \ldots, z_{n-1}$ are known, then let $z_n \in \partial K$ is a point at which

$\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}|z-z_j|$ attains its maximum. The row $\{z_{n,k}\}_{k=1}^{n}$ consists of the first n Leja points. Note that ν_n for the Leja points are asymptotically distributed like μ_K (see [6, Chapter V.1]).

Proposition. *Leja points are well separated.*

In what follows, L denotes a bounded *quasiconformal* arc which means that for any two points $z, \zeta \in L$,

$$\operatorname{diam} L(z,\zeta) \le c_4|z-\zeta|, \tag{2.3}$$

where $c_4 \ge 1$ is a constant, $L(z,\zeta)$ is a subrarc of L between these points, and diam S is the diameter of a set $S \subset \mathrm{C}$.

Theorem. *Let $K = L$. If ν_n are asymptotically distributed like μ_L and if Z is well separated, then Λ_n are subexponential.*

In the case $L = [-1,1]$, the above theorem implies Theorem B. Using the reasoning of [8, Section 7], one can further extend the above theorem to the case of K whose boundary consists of a finite number of quasiconformal arcs. Reichel (see [8, p. 465]), based on a numerical calculation, conjectured that the Lebesgue constants for Leja points are subexponential also for an arbitrary K. This challenging conjecture remains open still.

We denote by $c, c_1, c_2, \dots$ positive constants (different in different sections) which can depend only on K, L, and Z. Moreover, for positive functions a and b we use the order inequality $a \preceq b$ if $a \le cb$. The expression $a \asymp b$ means that $a \preceq b$ and $b \preceq a$ simultaneously.

3. Auxiliary results

Let $K = L$ and let function Φ map Ω conformally and univalently onto D^* such that $\Phi(\infty) = \infty, \Phi'(\infty) > 0$. Set $\Psi := \Phi^{-1}$. Since in this case $g_\Omega = \log|\Phi|$, we have

$$L_\delta = \{\zeta \in \Omega : |\Phi(\zeta)| = 1+\delta\}, \quad \delta > 0.$$

In this section, we mention some known results about metric properties of Φ and Ψ (see for more details [2]) and their consequences. Denote by z_1 and z_2 the endpoints of L. Since Φ can be extended continuously to these points, we set for $\delta > 0, j = 1, 2$, and $z \in L$

$$t_j := \Phi(z_j), \quad \mathrm{D}_1^* := \{t : |t| > 1, \arg t_1 < \arg t < \arg t_2\},$$
$$\mathrm{D}_2^* := \mathrm{D}^* \setminus \overline{\mathrm{D}_1^*}, \quad \Omega_j := \Psi(\mathrm{D}_j^*),$$
$$L_\delta^j := L_\delta \cap \overline{\Omega_j}, \quad \rho_\delta^j(z) := d(z, L_\delta^j),$$

so that

$$\rho_\delta(z) = \min_{j=1,2} \rho_\delta^j(z).$$

Denote by $\Phi_j, j = 1, 2$, the restriction of Φ to Ω_j and let $\tilde{z}_\delta^j := \Psi((1+\delta)\Phi_j(z))$. Since $\partial \mathrm{D}_j^*$ and $\partial\Omega_j$ are quasiconformal (see [2, p. 30, Lemma 2.8]), Φ_j can be extended to a quasiconformal mapping $\Phi_j : \overline{\mathbf{C}} \to \overline{\mathbf{C}}$. Therefore, the following statement holds.

Lemma 1 *([2, p. 29, Theorem 2.7]) Let $\zeta_k \in \overline{\Omega_j} \setminus \{\infty\}, \Phi_j(\zeta_k) =: \tau_{j,k}, j = 1, 2, k = 1, 2, 3$. Then the conditions $|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2| \preceq |\zeta_1 - \zeta_3|$ and $|\tau_{j,1} - \tau_{j,2}| \preceq |\tau_{j,1} - \tau_{j,3}|$ are equivalent.*

Let $z_\delta^j \in L_\delta^j$ satisfy $\rho_\delta^j(z) = |z - z_\delta^j|$. Lemma 1 with the triplet of points $z, \tilde{z}_\delta^j, z_\delta^j$ implies

$$\rho_\delta^j(z) \asymp |z - \tilde{z}_\delta^j|. \tag{3.1}$$

Let $\mathrm{T} := \{t : |t| = 1\}$ be the unit circle and $|S|$ denote the length of an arc $S \subset \mathrm{C}$. The function Ψ can be extended continuously to a function $\Psi : \overline{\mathrm{D}^*} \to \overline{\mathbf{C}}$, and for any subarc $J \subset L$, there exist two arcs $J_1' \subset \overline{\mathrm{D}_1^*} \cap \mathrm{T}$ and $J_2' \subset \overline{\mathrm{D}_2^*} \cap \mathrm{T}$ such that $\Psi(J_1') = \Psi(J_2') = J$ and the intersection $J_1' \cap J_2'$ consists of at most two points. Then

$$\mu_L(J) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(|J_1'| + |J_2'|\right) \tag{3.2}$$

(see [2, p. 22]).

Lemma 2 *For $Z = Z(L)$ the spacing condition (2.2) implies*

$$\mu_L(L(z_{n,k}, z_{n,j})) \succeq \frac{1}{n}, \quad 1 \le k, j \le n, k \ne j.$$

Proof. Let $j_0 = j_0(z_{n,k}, n)$ satisfy $\rho_{1/n}(z_{n,k}) = \rho_{1/n}^{j_0}(z_{n,k})$. Since by (2.2) and (3.1)

$$|z_{n,k} - (\tilde{z_{n,k}})_{1/n}^{j_0}| \asymp \rho_{1/n}^{j_0}(z_{n,k}) = \rho_{1/n}(z_{n,k}) \preceq |z_{n,k} - z_{n,j}|,$$

Lemma 1 with the triplet of points $z_{n,k}, (\tilde{z_{n,k}})_{1/n}^{j_0}, z_{n,j}$ and (3.2) yield

$$\mu_L(L(z_{n,k}, z_{n,j})) \ge \frac{1}{2\pi}|\Phi_{j_0}(z_{n,k}) - \Phi_{j_0}(z_{n,j})| \succeq \frac{1}{n}.$$

□

In the proof of the next lemma we use the notion and properties of the module of a family of curves, see [1, 4, 2] for more details.

Lemma 3 *For $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in L$,*

$$\mu_L(L(\xi_1, \xi_2)) \preceq |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^{1/2}. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Let $J := L(\xi_1, \xi_2)$. Without loss of generality we can assume that diam $J =: d < D := (\text{diam } L)/2$.

The main idea of the proof is to compare modules of the following families of curves. Denote by $\Gamma'_j, j = 1, 2$ the family of all crosscuts of D^* which separate $J'_j := \Phi_j(J)$ from ∞. Let $\Gamma_j := \Psi(\Gamma'_j)$ and

$$\Gamma_3 := \{\gamma_r := \{\zeta : |\zeta - \xi_1| = r\} : d < r < D\}.$$

Since $\Gamma_j < \Gamma_3$, i.e., each $\gamma_3 \in \Gamma_3$ contains $\gamma_j \in \Gamma_j$, according to [2, p. 343, Theorem 1.2; pp. 347-349, Examples 1.9 and 1.11], for their modules we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \log \frac{D}{d} = m(\Gamma_3) \leq m(\Gamma_j) = m(\Gamma'_j) \leq 2 + \frac{1}{\pi} \log \frac{4}{|J'_j|}.$$

Therefore, (2.3) yields

$$|J'_j| \leq \frac{4e^{2\pi}}{D^{1/2}} d^{1/2} \preceq |\xi_1 - \xi_2|^{1/2},$$

which, by virtue of (3.2), implies (3.3).

□

4. Proofs

Proof of Proposition. We use mathematical induction. Let $\{z_j\}_{j \in \mathrm{N}}$ be the Leja points for K. For $n = 2$ (2.2) is trivial. Next, assuming that (2.2) is true for $m = n - 1$, consider the polynomial

$$p_{n-1}(z) := \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (z - z_j)$$

for which we have $||p_{n-1}||_K = |p_{n-1}(z_n)|$. Here $|| \cdot ||_S$ is the uniform norm on $S \subset \mathrm{C}$. By the Bernstein-Walsh Lemma (see [9, p. 77] or [6, p. 153])

$$||p_{n-1}||_{K_{1/n}} \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-1} ||p_{n-1}||_K < e||p_{n-1}||_K.$$

Therefore, for $z \in \partial K$ and $\zeta \in \mathrm{C}$ with $|\zeta - z| \leq \rho/2$, where $\rho := \rho_{1/n}(z)$, we have

$$|p'_{n-1}(\zeta)| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\{\xi : |\xi - \zeta| = \rho/2\}} \frac{|p_{n-1}(\xi)|}{|\xi - \zeta|^2} |d\xi| \leq \frac{2e}{\rho} ||p_{n-1}||_K.$$

To verify (2.2) for $m = n$ we can assume that one of points in the left-hand side of (2.2) is z_n. In the case where $|z_n - z_j| < \rho_{1/n}(z_n)/2, j < n$ we obtain

$$||p_{n-1}||_K = |p_{n-1}(z_n)| \le \int_{[z_n, z_j]} |p'_{n-1}(\zeta)||d\zeta| \le \frac{2e|z_n - z_j|}{\rho_{1/n}(z_n)} ||p_{n-1}||_K$$

from which we have $|z_n - z_j| \succeq \rho_{1/n}(z_n)$. Moreover,

$$\rho_{1/n}(z_j) \le |z_j - z_n| + \rho_{1/n}(z_n) \preceq |z_j - z_n|$$

which completes the proof of (2.2).

□

Proof of Theorem. From the reasoning in [8, Section 4] we see that it is enough to show that for any sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ there exists $c_\delta > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0^+} c_\delta = 0, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \min_{1 \le k \le n} S_{n,k,\delta}^{1/n} \ge e^{-c_\delta}, \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$S_{n,k,\delta} := \prod_{z_{n,j} \in A_{n,k,\delta}} |z_{n,j} - z_{n,k}|$$

and

$$A_{n,k,\delta} := \{z_{n,j} : 1 \le j \le n, j \ne k, |z_{n,j} - z_{n,k}| \le \delta\}.$$

Let $\zeta_0 := z_{n,k}$. In the most complicated case where $A_{n,k,\delta} \cap L(\zeta_0, z_j) \ne \emptyset, j = 1, 2$ (here, as before, z_1 and z_2 are the endpoints of L), which we consider in detail, we rename the points in $A_{n,k,\delta}$ as follows

$$A_{n,k,\delta} = \bigcup_{m=-m_1, m \ne 0}^{m_2} \{\zeta_m\},$$

where $\zeta_m \in L(\zeta_{m-1}, \zeta_{m+1}), -m_1 + 1 \le m \le m_2 - 1$.

Since by Lemma 3

$$\mu_L(L(\zeta_{-m_1}, \zeta_{m_2})) \preceq \delta^{1/2},$$

Lemma 2 implies

$$m_j \le c_1 \delta^{1/2} n, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Taking into account that

$$m! \ge \left(\frac{m}{e}\right)^m, \quad m \in \mathrm{N},$$

and by Lemmas 2 and 3 for $-m_1 \le m \le m_2, m \ne 0$,

$$|\zeta_m - \zeta_0| \ge c_2 \mu_L(L(\zeta_m, \zeta_0))^2 \ge \left(\frac{c_3|m|}{n}\right)^2$$

we have

$$S_{n,k,\delta} \geq \prod_{m=-m_1, m\neq 0}^{m_2} \left(\frac{c_3|m|}{n}\right)^2 \geq \left(\frac{c_3 m_1}{en}\right)^{2m_1} \left(\frac{c_3 m_2}{en}\right)^{2m_2}.$$

Therefore, for sufficiently small δ,

$$S_{n,k,\delta}^{1/n} \geq \left(\frac{c_1 c_3 \delta^{1/2}}{e}\right)^{4c_1\delta^{1/2}}$$

which implies (4.2) with

$$c_\delta := 4c_1\delta^{1/2} \log \frac{e}{c_1 c_3 \delta^{1/2}}$$

satisfying (4.1).

□

5. Acknowledgements

Part of this work was done during the Fall of 2016 semester, while the author visited the Katholische Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt and the Julius Maximilian University of Würzburg. The author is also grateful to M. Nesterenko for his helpful comments.

References

[1] L.V. Ahlfors, Lectures on Quasiconformal Mappings, Van Nostrand, Princeton, N.J., 1966.

[2] V.V. Andrievskii, H.-P. Blatt, Discrepancy of Signed Measures and Polynomial Approximation, Springer-Verlag, Berlin/New York, 2002.

[3] D. Gaier, Lectures On Complex Approximation, Birkhäuser, Boston/Basel/Stuttgart, 1987.

[4] O. Lehto, K.I. Virtanen, Quasiconformal Mappings in the Plane, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1973.

[5] T. Ransford, Potential Theory in the Complex Plane, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[6] E.B. Saff , V. Totik, Logarithmic Potentials with External Fields, Springer-Verlag, New York/Berlin, 1997.

[7] V.I. Smirnov, N.A. Lebedev, Functions of a Complex Variable. Constructive Theory, Mass. Institute of Technology, Cambridge, 1968.

[8] R. Taylor, V. Totik, Lebesgue constants for Leja points, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis 30 (2010) 462–486.

[9] J.L. Walsh, Interpolation and Approximation by Rational Functions in the Complex Plane, 5th ed., American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1969.